

National Sovereignty in the Nuclear Age

National Sovereignty in the Nuclear Age

Ales Bebler



Indian Council for Cultural Relations

National Sovereignty in the Nuclear Age
© 1972 Indian Council for Cultural Relations

First published in 1972

Published by
Secretary
Indian Council for Cultural Relations
Azad Bhavan
Indraprastha Estate
New Delhi-1

Printed in India by
Indraprastha Press (CBT),
Bahadurshah Zafar Marg
New Delhi-1.

Publisher's Preface

The Indian Council for Cultural Relations is an autonomous body set up by the Government of India in 1950 with a view to establishing, reviving and strengthening cultural relations between India and other countries. This aim is sought to be achieved through a broad range of activities.

Instituted in 1958 by the Indian Council for Cultural Relations, as a mark of honour to the memory of its first President, the Azad Memorial Lectures are intended to contribute towards the promotion of better understanding among different peoples of the world. Eminent scholars from India and abroad are invited to speak on subjects of fundamental importance to all of us.

The first series of Azad Memorial Lectures was delivered in 1959 by the late Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, first Prime Minister of India, on *India Today and Tomorrow*.

1960: Professor Arnold Toynbee, the eminent historian, spoke on *One World and India*.

1961: The Rt. Hon. Lord Attlee spoke on *The Future of the United Nations and the Future of Democracy*.

1962: Prof. Sir C.V. Raman spoke on *The Gateways of Human Knowledge*.

- 1963: Prof. Dr. Walter Hallstein spoke on *The European Community — A New Path to Peaceful Union*.
- 1964: Dr. Carlos P. Romulo spoke on *Contemporary Nationalism and World Order*.
- 1965: Dr. Rene Maheu, Director General, Unesco, spoke on *International Cooperation: Techniques and Ethics*.
- 1967: Dr. Linus Carl Pauling spoke on *Science and World Peace and the World of the Future*.
- 1969: Dr. D.S. Kothari spoke on *Atom, Man and Ahimsa*.
- 1970: The Rt. Hon. Lord Butler PC, CH spoke on *Survival Depends on Higher Education*.

The Azad Memorial Lecture for 1972 on *National Sovereignty in the Nuclear Age* by Dr. Ales Bebler is contained in the present volume.

Lecture I

THE lectures to which I have the honour to contribute this year are devoted to the memory of one of the greatest men in the recent history of your country—the late Maulana Azad. It is not by mere coincidence that this function is taking place today, precisely on the twelfth anniversary of his passing away. For both of these reasons, the thoughts of all of us go to this man, whose eager search of knowledge earned him the reputation of a brilliant scholar and whose love for his fatherland made him a great fighter for truth and one of the most influential political leaders in your struggle for independence, brotherhood and human dignity.

I have to admit, that the invitation to be the main speaker at your session was for me a surprise and that it made me rather confused. Much more so when I was shown the list of the previous speakers in front of this distinguished audience, a list headed by one of the greatest men of our century, the late Jawaharlal Nehru and including such great contemporaries as Linus Pauling. Nevertheless, the prospect of visiting your wonderful country once again, of meeting once more your present-day leaders and particularly your Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira

Gandhi, for whom I feel a profound respect and admiration, of meeting so many Indian friends, and, last but not least, of addressing such an audience as the present one, was too strong a temptation to be resisted. The invitation was not only a great honour for me personally but also a gesture of sympathy for my country. You first invited my friend, Mr. Eduard Kardelj. As you know he gladly accepted the invitation but to his great regret he was unable, for state reasons, to make the long journey to India at this time. You could have then easily found a prominent speaker from some other country, but you insisted on having a speaker from Yugoslavia, which profoundly touched me and everybody in my country.

Let me first state that I call our age the nuclear age but I do it very conditionally, for the sake of brevity. Properly speaking our age, the nuclear age, is, part of a much longer age: the industrial age. This had started at the time of the Renaissance in Europe; but actually it was a world-wide phenomenon. One can trace the same signs of a new age in Asia. While devoting myself to the history of South Asia, some years ago, I discovered—which cannot be a matter of surprise to South Asians like you—signs of this New Age in Java, Malacca and Gujarat corresponding to the European phenomenon in Venice, Gurova and Florence. I speak of manufacturing, mining, banking, stock-exchange, long-distance sea-faring and trade of raw materials and manufactured goods on a large international scale.

But, I do not intend to sketch a history of the world economy from the Renaissance to our time. The main features of it are, in any case, well known. They can best be traced if we consider the source of mechanic, non-muscular energy at the disposal of man, from water power used on a large scale, to steam, from steam to electricity, to atomic and nuclear energy. We might foresee, as things go faster and faster the use of energy imprisoned in parts of the nucleus of the atom, in the proton.

In short, the nuclear age is only a fraction and may be, not a very lasting one, of a longer period of time with many features in common.

The use of nuclear energy is only one feature of our time, even in technology. The present leap forward in civilization, often called a new scientific and technological revolution, has more important features than this one. We are fascinated by the power of thermo-nuclear weapons as we were earlier fascinated by the atomic ones. But both present only one side of our present technology. Besides atomic fission and nuclear fusion we have at our disposal the outer parts of atoms separated from their nuclea—the electrons; and they play, in economics, a greater role than the nuclea. Electronic devices are the most characteristic devices of this stage of development, the most prominent such device being the computer. It seems to have been the invention responsible for the ever growing speed in the progress of science and technology of our time. We have the ever growing use of the smallest electrones, the ones

on the boundary between matter and energy, the photons, or more simply, light. Bundles of light, lasers, promise great new possibilities. There will be computers using lasers instead of electricity, and their capacity for data storage will be far greater, the combined use of thermo-nuclear fusion and lasers in the foreseeable future will open the door to a practically limitless source of energy since the raw material for its production is available in immense quantity: the water of all the oceans!

Besides these and so many other new discoveries on the nature and qualities of matter and in other fields of the exact science and so many other inventions in all fields of interest for the future of humanity such as biochemistry, what is particularly remarkable in our time, is the ever increasing speed of this whole progress. Every decade brings more progress in science and technology than the previous one.

I dwelt at length on this aspect of present day history to lay as firm a foundation as I could for the following conclusion: the level of scientific knowledge and of technological knowhow reached at the present moment allows for the prospect of a prosperous and happy life for the entire human race, free from hunger and all kinds of want, with adequate housing, clothing, food, schooling, medical assistance and high level of culture.

Naturally, the present advance in science and technology can best be made to serve mankind, when humanity is free from fear; a world in which all parts of humanity would have absolute confidence

in each other and would feel no need to distrust or destroy each other.

How can this be achieved? Who, or what human forces, could be the builders of such a brilliant future?

Before attempting to answer these most challenging questions of our time, let me do away with the most common objection to the thesis that the above prospect has become more of a dream. The fundamental objection to this objection is simply the fact that there is no other choice than the one before us: of a higher stage of all-human relations. As it has always been, human beings gathered in ever larger communities. They went from tribes to city-states, from these to antique kingdoms or republics, from these to feudal duchies and merchant republics and from these to modern national states. The pressure towards a higher degree of unity than the national states of our days is deeply felt. And it yields results. Groups of states, unions of states, common markets are on the agenda of the history of our day. International cooperation has become a categoric imperative of our time. The United Nations is its foremost concrete expression.

The need and the will is at hand. There can be no doubt. What remains to be done is to discover the way to the goal.

In this respect I have to remind you that our generation is not the first to tackle the problem. Our generation is only more concerned with it, which shows how much closer we are to the goal.

It was not a coincidence that the first outspoken and articulate advocates of international understanding and cooperation were the French rationalists, Jean-Jacques Rousseau and his school, the forerunners of the Great French Revolution, and their pupils, the Jacobins. It was none other than Maximilien Robespierre who drafted a "Declaration of International Law" and submitted it to the National Convention on April 24th, 1793. In this draft we read, among other things:

Art. 1 Men of all lands are brothers and nations should assist each other according to their possibilities as well as the citizens of one state.

Art. 2 Everyone who oppresses one nation declares himself to be an enemy of all nations.

Art. 7 No nation has the right to interfere in the administration of other nations.

Art. 10 Every nation is master of its own territory.

Art. 17 Every nation can wage war for the defence of its sovereignty, its liberty and its property.

Art. 22 Treaties between Nations are sacred and have to be respected.

A similar draft comes to us from that other famous Jacobin, the Abbot Gregoire. His draft contains formulas similar to Robespierre's as the following additions:

Nations are mutually in a natural relationship; the link between them is the universal morality.

Nations are independent from each other and sovereign, irrespective of the number of individuals who compose them and the extent of the territory

they inhabit.

Compared to what was previously said on the subject—by Jean Jacques Rousseau, whose *Social Contract* was the bedside book of Robespierre, by Montesquieu or by the fathers of the American Revolution in their Declaration of Independence and elsewhere—this is very much more. The nation is declared to be the subject of international law. All nations, irrespective of the number of citizens or size of territory are equal in rights. They all have the right to independence, to defence if confronted with dangers from without, to the disposal of their territory and to equality of partnership in concluding treaties with other nations. Interference from without is prohibited and even more important, conquest and national oppression. Universal morality is proclaimed as the supreme Law of Nations.

It follows from this that all nations are equal not in their rights; but there is also the obligation of every nation to respect the rights of every other nation. They are sovereign, which means free to act at their discretion but only to the limit where they meet the same rights of other nations. In other words: they are sovereign but their sovereignty is not absolute. It is limited by the sovereignty of others. It is relative. It is necessarily relative, because the relativity of sovereignty is the imperative condition of the right of all nations to equality. And still more, their sovereignty can and shall express itself in such other international obligations as they freely choose to contract for the common benefit of the

high contracting parties, as we say today. No limit to such freely undertaken obligations is defined. Therefore they can relinquish of their free will such portions of their sovereignty as they choose, they can enter confederations, federations, unions with such other nations of their choice. They can, theoretically, form a world union of nations.

Naturally, this was not the prospective of those times. It is merely the logic of the reasoning that can be read into the formulas popular in those times.

The opponents of the Jacobins had another logic. It was not formulated. It can only be read into their acts, their deeds. The Thermidorians and then Napoleon Bonaparte, while still singing the very revolutionary *Marseillaise* and holding high the tricolore with the slogan of Liberty, Equality, Brotherhood, trampled the principles of international brotherhood under the boots of their armies and Bonaparte became the great aggressor and oppressor of Europe. The nations of Europe, as a rule, were not misled by the flag and the slogan and even today they hold in reverence the memory of the fighters against Bonaparte. In the Soviet Union, for instance, the memory of Kutuzov, the victorious Tzarist general, is in high esteem.

Since those times on we can trace the conflict between the two tendencies in the field of international relations. Out of this conflict we can infer a law. It is the following: The more a political thinker is close to the common man, to the common people, the more democratic and progressive he is,

the more he is inclined to the concept of equality and brotherhood of nations. And conversely, the more conservative, anti-democratic and reactionary he is, the more he is opposed to that concept. The two attitudes are profoundly linked. They have the same roots. They are essentially two sides of the same attitude.

Time does not permit me to even sketch the history of the lineage of great European democrats of the 19th century with respect to their approach in the field of international relations. This lineage goes from the liberals of the thirties and their contemporaries, the romantic poets such as Lord Byron, Friedrich Schiller and Alexander Puskin, to the revolutionaries of 1848 such as Gambetta and the national revolutionaries of the type of Giuseppe Garibaldi in the sixties.

Meanwhile a new school of thought of great future appears in Europe on the democratic side. It was and is linked till today with the name of the giant scholar and thinker: Karl Marx. The teachings of this man on international relations lifted the fundamentals of the rationalist—Jacobin doctrine to a new height. What Marx—who relied on the industrial workers, the proletariat, to change the social order of his days into a better one—was primarily concerned with, in international relations, was the relationship of the proletariat of industrially developed countries and the oppressed nations of his time. In this respect his attitude could be summed up in the following two propositions:

(1) The division of the world into oppressing and oppressed, is a phenomenon accompanying the development of capitalism; colonial conquests having started at the time of mercantilism, increased tremendously at the beginning of the modern industrial age.

(2) The fight of colonial and other oppressed peoples is part and parcel of the fight for the socialist transformation of human society on a world-wide scale; progressive social forces of oppressing nations—the proletariat of Europe—should therefore give the fullest support to the liberation movements of the oppressed peoples; by doing so the European proletariat fights for his own victory.

Marx's famous formula was that a people oppressing other peoples cannot be free itself.

The most significant step forward in political thinking was thus the following: to the concept of the *right* of all nations to sovereign equality was added the duty of all peoples to support each other in their striving for equality; equality is a goal, while solidarity is the means of achieving it; the cosmopolitanism and humanism of the Jacobins, the liberals and the romanticists was thus developed into what we now call internationalism.

Marx's attitude, his internationalism, was not merely a theoretical or a platonic attitude. Nor was it an invitation to others to do what he proposed. It was the attitude of an active political worker, who did what he said. He spoke publicly and wrote articles for the daily press on events of his time in

his internationalist spirit. He became known as a staunch supporter of the liberation movement of the Irish people, as an active opponent of the Opium wars in China, as an implacable enemy of British rule in India

It was an intense pleasure for me, a European marxist and one closely connected with India and deeply interested in Indian affairs, to reread—while preparing this address—Marx's, and his friend Engels's, articles on India, particularly the articles entitled "The British Rule in India", "The Government of India", "The East India Question". Marx followed constantly the events on the Indian sub-continent. He wrote on taxes in India, on land tenure in India, on the policy of the East India Company, etc. In these articles Marx presented a startling picture of oppression and ruin imposed upon the Indian people by the colonialists. He wrote: "There cannot...remain any doubt but that the misery inflicted by the British on Hindustan is of an essentially different and infinitely more intensive kind than all Hindustan had to suffer before." The British bourgeoisie, he wrote, "dragged individuals and people through blood and dirt, through misery and degradation" while being forced itself to sow the seeds of capitalist industry in India. But....."all the English bourgeoisie may be forced to do, will neither emancipate nor materially mend the social condition of the mass of the people, depending not only on the development of the productive powers, but on their appropriation by the people." And he drew the

conclusion: The liberation of India from the British yoke is the only thing that can bring about the “regeneration of that great and interesting country.”

When the great revolt—called the great mutiny by the British—broke out in India in 1857, Marx and Engels wrote a series of articles in which they followed the revolt step by step. The articles are written with the deepest sympathy for the struggle against the oppressions. They contain information and analysis of all the stages of the revolt, showing its causes, its nation-wide scope and its connection with—I quote literally—“a general disaffection exhibited against English supremacy on the part of the great Asiatic nations”, since “The revolt of the Bengal army being, beyond doubt, intimately connected with the Persian and Chinese wars.” Marx was overjoyed with the unity of different elements in India appearing in the struggle. He wrote—I quote again: “Before this there had been mutinies in the Indian Army, but the present revolt is distinguished by characteristic and fatal features. It is the first time that...Mussulmans and Hindus, renouncing their mutual antipathies, have combined against their common masters, that disturbances beginning with the Hindus, have actually ended in placing on the throne of Delhi a Mohammedan Emperor.”

Marx's teachings had an immense impact. Large workers' parties appeared all over Europe. They combined in what became known as the 2nd Socialist International. All the sections of this large body accepted, among others, Marx's concept on

international relations. I read with deep emotion, an artist's account of the Congress of the International celebrated in the Swiss city of Basel in 1917 contained in the novel of one of the greatest modern French writers—Louis Aragon, entitled *Les cloches de Bale*. What an outbreak of sincere internationalism, of hatred of war! The delegates felt the approach of World War I and declared war on war!

It turned out, later, when the war broke out, that not all of those parties, represented at Basel, behaved as they decided to behave. Consequently, a new, more radical trend appeared in the ranks of some socialist parties. Those who were true to the spirit of Basel, gathered around the most clear-minded new great brain among them: it was Vladimir Ilitsch Ulianov—Lenin, the leader of the left-wing Russian social-democrats, called the Bolsheviks.

Lenin's teachings on international relations are a continuation of the teachings of Marx.

What interests us most in this further development of Marx's teachings? Lenin was confronted with a different world from that of Marx's times. Marx characterised his era with the term Imperialism. Lenin found the word appropriate and used it. The situation he labeled: the highest point of capitalism, and described it as the situation in which (I quote Lenin) "around 70% of the world population belong to oppressed peoples, who are either in direct colonial dependence or belong to the peripheric colonial states such as Persia, Turkey, China, or have found

themselves, after their defeat by a great imperialist state, being dependent on it," while there is on the top of this world pyramid of nations "a small number of oppressor nations who dispose of a colossal wealth and great military power".

Facing this situation Lenin foresaw that this was the *last* stage of world capitalism and that the pyramid was about to collapse. And all his efforts from then on were concentrated on bringing about this collapse by raising a revolt in his home-country, which he considered one of the weakest points in the pyramid. He achieved this task. His party, the Bolsheviks siezed power and established a socialist state.

And it is then, that Lenin made the most significant addition to Marx's teaching on the national question. Being confronted with a large socialist nation, he was by the same token confronted with the question of the relationship of such a nation with other nations, with nations that are not socialist. This was the more a challenging question as the Bolsheviks expected other if not all European nations to soon follow the Russian example. Should such a development be fostered by socialist Russia? Is it the right or even the duty of socialist Russia to intervene in Europe to bring about socialist revolutions in countries outside her own borders?

On this point you might know that there was among the most prominent leaders of the Russian revolution a man, called Lev Trosky, who was inclined to the concept of revolutionary wars. Lenin

was opposed to this concept. He wrote so much about this point that I am embarrassed in the choice of possible quotations. I shall nevertheless say at least this, that in Lenin's writings of this time, there appears continuously the formula he must have found very convincing: "No nation has the right to impose happiness on any other nation." He completed Marx's formula that a nation oppressing other nations cannot be a free nation by saying that a nation oppressing other nations cannot be a socialist nation. And he predicted that not every socialist country shall forever be immune from sins in this respect. He wrote: "The proletariat shall not become saint and safe of errors and weaknesses by the sole fact that it has performed a socialist revolution. But possible mistakes (and egotistical interests—the temptation of riding on another fellow's back) shall inevitably bring it to correct conclusions."

This was the consistency of Lenin in applying Marx's teachings to his time, to the situation, brought about by a socialist revolution in one country only. This was simultaneously the highest water-mark in the development of Marxist thought on the national question in the Bolshevik Party.

After this the decline becomes visible.

When Marx and Engels founded and inspired the II International, they opposed consistently the tendency of some of the member-parties to be the leading ones. They thought that all member-parties, large or small, of large nations or of smaller ones, are and ought to be, equals. They inferred

this conclusion from their fundamental tenet: the equality of nations. Now, a few years after the successful October revolution, the Bolshevik party, a party in power in a very large country, the largest in Europe, took in practice the opposite position. Instead of behaving with particular modesty and care precisely because in power and willynilly representing a large state, the Bolshevik party, proud of its performance, proclaimed their concepts on everything on earth as the only correct and the only progressive ones. They inspired the splitting of the workers parties, gathered in Moscow, representatives of the communist parties (not yet all under this appellation) and celebrated the founding congress of a new, the III International. From the beginning to the end the Bolsheviks set the tune, and their representatives were elected to the leading positions in the new organization.

But this is only a minor error when compared with the following one. This much greater error was committed with respect to the national-liberation movements in colonial and semi-colonial countries. The withdrawing of the revolutionary wings of European workers parties in developed countries and their gathering into one international revolutionary workers organization was viewed in a kindly light by the Bolsheviks. But the Bolsheviks did not take kindly to the national-liberation movements of the developing countries; they did not view them as Marxist-inspired class movements. The International should have treated them as Marx treated the

great mutiny, as an ally who has his own fight to fight and does it in his own way. Marx sympathized and gave moral assistance to the sepoys and thought it just fine that they put a Muslim Moghul on the throne of Delhi, a man who was miles apart from European socialism. Not so the Bolsheviks. In the face of national-liberation movements in colonial and semi-colonial countries, they took a critical position towards the ideologies of these movements, advised communists of such countries to pull out of them and build their own parties. The ideologies prevailing in such movements were condemned as erroneous.

This trend, little noticeable in Lenin's time, became more and more apparent as the personality of Stalin came to the fore. It was finally a well established new tenet of the Bolsheviks in the International that they were in possession of the sole truth, while everybody else was wrong.

At its Sixth Congress, in September 1928, the Communist International adopted a rather extensive document entitled *Program of the Communist International*. It contained among many other chapters, a chapter entitled "Ideologies in the working class hostile to communism." After a sharp criticism of western socialists and social-democrats and a number of other western leftist groups, from the Fabian Society to the anarchists, it went on to say: "In the colonial countries, as among the oppressed peoples and races as a whole, communism comes into collision with the influence of certain peculiar

tendencies in the labour movement, which had some positive part to play at a certain stage of development, but have become reactionary in the new stage.”

Then the document deals in some detail with three such tendencies: Sun Yat-Senism in China, Gandhism in India and Garveyism among American Negroes.

On Gandhism it says textually: “Trends such as Gandhism in India, which, permeated through and through with religious conceptions, idealize the most backward and economically reactionary ways of living, and see salvation not in proletarian socialism but in the return to those backward forms, which preach patience and reject the class struggle, turn in the course of the development of the revolution into openly reactionary forces. More and more Gandhism is becoming an ideology directed against the revolution of the popular masses. Communism must fight against it relentlessly.”

This was a great error and more than that. It was a service to imperialism. It was the splitting of progressive forces, on a world wide scale, into parts which were pushed into fighting each other instead of joining forces against the imperialist pyramid and building on its ruins a better world, a world of equal nations.

History was not stopped by this error. The movements of national liberation went to each under its own flag and most of them were victorious under their flags. India achieved liberty under the flag of Gandhi and without any assistance from the III

International which, let it be said by the way, was disbanded by that time.

Now I am so close to our own time that I have, before dealing with contemporary problems, to fill, at least shortly, a gap in my survey of times past. The gap concerns the right wing, the conservatives and reactionaries of Europe, in their attitude to matters like international relations.

I can be short in this respect primarily because the attitude of this wing is better known. While the European left was in the shadow of history, and till the October revolution in Russia, entirely in opposition, the right wing was dominant. It was this wing that made history. It was under the leadership of this wing that western Europe and the United States of America conquered the larger part of all other continents and built the pyramid with themselves on the top. Therefore I would not be saying anything very new if I tried to outline the thinking on international affairs, of such men as Talleyrand, Metternich, Napoleon the third, Bismarck and the German Kaisers or the Russian Tzars, of Gladstone, Disraeli or the like. Each of them claimed for their country all the imaginable rights and denied any right to less developed peoples and nations. They all claimed and justified their right to the conquest of foreign lands and the right to rule over foreign peoples.

How similar they were they manifested openly and publicly at a much too forgotten occasion: the Berlin Conference on Africa in 1878. The conference was called together by Bismarck and the then

German Kaiser and was attended by all the great powers of the time. The goal of the Conference was to prevent these powers from clashing while conquering Africa. A unanimous decision was taken and it was the following: any conquest of territory in Africa can be admitted and accepted by all the participant powers under two conditions; first: the conquest ought to be effective, by means of force on the spot (and not on a map, for instance) and, second, it has to be duly notified to all other participants. No other conditions? The will of the Africans was no subject of discussion, was not even mentioned. The Concert (as they called themselves) of powers took the role of a self-appointed government of the world. The participant powers arrogated to themselves an absolute sovereignty, a limitless sovereignty, while the sovereignty of others was declared to be nil.

Your country was then under the sway of British rule. You might therefore be reminded of how the British views, the views of the ruling quarters in the British Empire were summed up by the greatest British authority on international public law towards the end of the previous and the beginning of our century, by professor Oppenheim.

In his treatise on International Law, the standard work in Britain, the professor wrote textually: "A State has always the possibility of acquiring political and other advantages at the expense of another State not only by means of violence, but also by direct recourse to war.... War is a legitimate means of

compulsion and consent given in pursuance thereof could not properly be regarded as tainted with invalidity....The validity of the title of the subjugating state does not depend upon recognition on the part of other powers. Nor is a mere protest of a third power of any legal weight....The great powers are the leaders of the family of Nations, and every advance of the Law of Nations during the past has been the result of their political hegemony....”

We know the world order built on this law of the jungle. It was the above mentioned pyramidal world order. It looked stable for a while but was in reality a world order pregnant with its own destruction. It was antihistoric. It was contrary to the profound undercurrent nourished by the will of all peoples and nations to be masters each of their own destiny. A worldwide crisis of the imperialist world order broke out openly with the outbreak of World War I.

Given a pyramidal world order, a great war could only have been between two parts of the top of this pyramid. World War I was a war between two groups of slave-owners. It is true that the Entente's claim was that they fought for democracy such as they have had at home—and against the German militarism and autocracy, while the Central Powers invented nothing better than that they fought for the glory of their Kaisers and the glory of their arms and flags. At the end of the war, the victorious powers of the Entente reshaped Europe only to the extent of granting liberty to those peoples oppressed

before the war by the other side: Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, and reshaped Africa in a yet more significant way by appropriating and partitioning among themselves the previous German colonies as well as the possessions of the Ottoman Empire in this continent and in the Middle East.

Nevertheless, if at the surface only the defeated Empires were crushed, the pre-war global pyramid was shaken. The victorious powers too had lost a good portion of their prestige and strength as world rulers. It was not a coincidence that one of their allies—tzarist Russia—was no more a friend at the war's end. Having been a Franco-British semi-colony, the peoples of Russia succeeded in a revolution which was simultaneously socialist and anti-imperialist, to liberate themselves entirely from all foreign bondage. Soon after the war a mass movement of national liberation started in one of the most populous countries of the world: India. Besides, the first decade after the war saw a further, a higher stage, of the Chinese revolution with the victory of the Kuo-Min-Tang. Humanity's progressive forces were after all the real victors.

So much so, that with the revival of German imperialism, this time under Hitler, Germany undertook a new aggressive war, the opposite great powers could have hoped for a victory only under the condition that they sought support wherever they could find it. Although Great Britain, France and the United States were countries of the most classical brand of imperialism, they were compelled to accept

support from anti-imperialist forces, the Soviet Union, the Indian liberation movement and other similar parties. Although imperialists, they went to war under anti-imperialist slogans. Their slogans became, by this token, an essential element of world progress. The behaviour of the leaders of the Indian National Congress Party was typical. Requested to furnish a war effort in favour of Britain they answered that since the war was a war for liberty they were ready to offer assistance to the British against their formal and solemn pledge that India would be free after the victory of the world democratic alliance, that it would have swaraj!

Hence the difference between the two camps in World War II was essential. The German-Italian-Japanese camp was overtly fighting for the supremacy of their nations and races who were proclaimed superior to others. The Nazi-Germans proclaimed their race to be a master race (*Herrenvolk*). For the sake of this platform not only blacks and yellows were designed to be inferior, but opposed whites were racially questionable. The French were semi-Negros and the Russians semi-Mongolians. Among the yellows the Japanese were a superior race. With respect to sovereignty this meant that the inferior races were denied not only their right to any kind of equality but even *the right to exist*. The right to sovereignty fell *below zero*. The master-races, on the contrary arrogated to themselves the right to absolute sovereignty, a sovereignty going as far as to include the right to genocide with respect to all

other races and nations.

The world democratic coalition on the contrary developed a more and more democratic program. From the London declaration to the Atlantic Charter and finally, just before the war's end, to the Charter of the United Nations, a program was worked out in which the most lofty democratic principles were incorporated: the right of all peoples to self determination, the right of all nations large and small, to sovereign equality, respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all individuals without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion, the duty of all nations to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours etc.

Whatever the individual governments or statesmen of the great democratic coalition might have had in mind when signing the two Charters, it was there. Some might have agreed to it and signed and ratified it in a mood of high irony. One of them even said it publicly. It was Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of Great Britain throughout the war. After the ratification of the Atlantic Charter he was asked a question about it in the House of Commons, and he answered that the Atlantic Charter did not mean the end of the British Empire. When negotiations on the future of India started in 1942 and India was offered the status of Dominion, Churchill said that in this case there cannot be a Dominion with the same independence as Canada, because that would be the end of the British Empire which could not be con-

templated.

In spite of such reserves, I repeat, the Atlantic Charter, and even more, the Charter of the United Nations are a reality.

I fought the entire last war from the moment hostilities reached my country to the bitter end in the ranks of Tito's Liberation Army. And I am an eye-witness of the spirit of the fighters of that army and of the civilian population who gave it assistance. It was, I assure you, a spirit of fighters for freedom without reserve. Not one of them thought for a moment that we fought only to expell Germans, Italians, Hungarians and Bulgarians out of our fatherland; and not one of them would have accepted the idea of our country under any kind of foreign control.

I am sure this was the spirit of millions and hundreds of millions of men and women throughout the world. The war was a war for liberty and liberty had to come with victory; that was the predominant belief all over the globe. The anti-imperialist movement having started in the first decade of our century, having advanced tremendously through the first world war, having gone on relentlessly between the two wars, made a decisive leap forward with the victory of the world democratic coalition in the second world war, and has reached the point of fulfilment of its final objectives after the second war. During the two decades following the war, colonialism practically disappeared. The greatest nation under foreign bondage, India, became free. A few

years later, China completed a revolution similar to the October revolution some 30 years earlier, a revolution simultaneously socialist and anti-imperialist, then followed the Arabs and finally the black Africans: dozens of peoples under foreign rule became free nations with all the attributes of sovereign states. Each of them after having won home-rule from their masters, requested to be admitted to the United Nations and were admitted. They consider this admission as a crowning of their national sovereignty. The United Nations was transformed from a group of about sixty member-states, with only 5 non-whites in 1946 to an organization of more than 130 states including all races, colonial relationships have become an exception.

It so happened that I attended the founding meeting of the UN in Church House, London, in 1945 and all the sessions of the United Nations General Assembly from 1945 to 1952. And then, because of different assignments at home, in Western Europe and in South Asia, I failed to see one more such Assembly till 1968. I shall never forget the impression the hall of the General Assembly then offered. From an Assembly of whites it had turned to a predominantly coloured Assembly. And how much the coloureds had to say and how they liked to gather as the Afro-Asian group! The presidents of different bodies, of Commissions, had to announce that on such a day the Commission cannot meet because of a meeting of the Afro-Asians! I felt a profound satisfaction. Our fight, all the bloodshed

in the war and after, was not shed without purpose. A better world was born. In no epoch of history has there been so many sovereign nations, sovereign and recognizing each other's sovereignty. Never in history could representatives of practically all the world community of nations meet in one hall and discuss problems common to all humans.

The United Nations, with all that it represents and embodies and more so with all its moral potential, is an immense achievement of the progressive forces of the world. It is—in spite of all its shortcomings and deficiencies—a conquest no enemy can take away from the vast majority of mankind which needs the United Nations and defends it against everyone who dislikes or even hates it. No government ever contemplated pulling out of the “machin” (as General de Gaulle termed it) knowing that the world's public opinion would go against such an act.

Everybody swears to believe, cherish and obey the above mentioned fundamental principles of the Charter. No one ever dared to say openly that he is opposed to the principle of sovereign equality of nations large and small, that he is opposed to the principle of the right of peoples to self-determination, that he is opposed to the principle of the duty to practise tolerance and live in peace and good neighbourly relations with other nations.

Those and many more rules embodied in the New Law of Nations, the Law of the United Nations, have become a common good of humanity. And

therefore world public opinion demands of everybody to abide by this law; this constitutes a pressure on every individual government which is tempted to transgress the Law and it is an automatic condemnation of every individual government having transgressed the Law. That is why no government admits of having transgressed the Law and goes out of its way to prove the often unprovable, namely that someone else transgressed the Law in the given case.

We have achieved a lot. We have destroyed the pyramid and created a world of equally sovereign nations. A great dream has come true.

Yet we are not happy.

While attending the General Assembly of the United Nations, I listened to the General Debate from beginning to end; to all the 128 speeches which lasted more than two months. And I found that there was not one single speaker who could say: ours is a happy country in a happy world. They all had complaints, they all had accusations against other states. All of them, wealthy and poor, large and small, were unhappy.

The world of universal sovereign equality is by far not a happy world. What is the matter? Where lies the very fundamental reason for the great evils of our time and where is the capital remedy to be found?

Chapter II

There are a few fundamental laws of development of human society, laws deriving from human nature and from the nature of humanity's natural environment, the physical world in which we live.

The first such law is the law commanding human beings to earn their livelihood in a struggle with their natural surroundings from which they have to extract what they need to survive and proliferate. In this struggle for life they endeavour to extract from nature as much as they can with as little pain, blood and sweat, as possible. To achieve this end they invent tools; the tool's role is to augment the *productivity* of labour. The first law can therefore be formulated as the law of constant endeavour of humans to enhance the productivity of their labour.

The second law is the law of acceleration of the process of rising productivity. A higher degree of productivity is favourable to further and faster advance in productivity. Stages of development tend to be shorter and shorter in their duration. The paleolithic age lasted hundreds of thousands of years; the neolithic only tens of thousands; the bronze age only a few thousand years; the iron age 1 to 1.5 thousand years; the manufacturing age only a few centuries, and along came the steam engine and electricity age followed after only 1 or 1.5 cen-

ture by the nuclear-electronic age of our times. And we are already on the threshold of the age of lasers, photosynthesis and the like.

We are told that science and technology advanced more during the last decade than in the previous 5 centuries, and that the new advance per year is greater than it was for several decades past.

This second law can therefore be formulated as the law of spontaneous self-acceleration of science and technology.

These two laws play into the hands of human progress. They are as two magnanimous and benevolent great dieties presiding over the destiny of mankind.

But there is a third law, a law that is like a malignant diety or semi-diety, rather like a Sugriva of your old legends.

It is the law of unequal development of human societies. Differences in climate, quality of soil, the quantity of natural resources of all kinds, natural raw materials, the tools of production manufactured at the previous stage of development, social conditions brought about in the previous stage of development, etc., all yield different results at every given new stage of development. Combined with the effects of the second law of spontaneous acceleration of development, this law leads not only to differences in the productivity of labour but tends to accelerate the differentiation between them. The more technologically advanced cultures advance faster than the

technologically underdeveloped cultures: and the difference between them grows ever wider.

We all know these laws and we all know their effect. We know the favourable effects of the first two. They have brought us from the stone age and its miseries to the present; we know as well the effect of the third law, and we know its disastrous consequences; we know of the conflicts between groups of humans when they are at different levels of development.

Some years ago, when I was posted as my country's Ambassador to Indonesia, I devoted much time to the prehistory and history of South-East Asia. I found that all the scholars on the subject agreed that some ten to twelve thousand years ago, there was an invasion from the north of what is now the Indonesian archipelago; the invaders came from the present Chinese province of Yunan. It was an invasion of people armed with polished stone tools, the Proto-Malays, while the autochthonous people had unpolished stone axes. Those with unpolished stone tools were massacred and practically wiped out. About four millenia ago, there was a fresh invasion from the north. The Deutero-Malays riding on water-buffaloes, armed with bronze weapons invaded the archipelago, coming from the area of Dong-Song, the present North Vietnam. They massacred the polished stone people or pushed them away from the fertile plains to the hills and became the ruling race. After three thousand years of hard work they developed a feudalistic, and

then a mercantile, society with a high standard of life when along came people of a similar civilization: the Portuguese. The decisive clash took place in 1511 in the Straits of Malacca between the Portuguese fleet and the fleet of the then most mighty ruler of South-East Asia, the Sultan of Malacca. It was a long and bloody battle. Both had similar vessels, both had guns with power. Yet the Portuguese proved technically superior, won the battle, occupied the splendid city of Malacca, massacred the native population and introduced thereby an epoch of European domination over South-East Asia.

In the 19th century the British, using the techniques of the modern industrial age, possessing the steam engine and the like, overwhelmed the Moghul Empire in India and all Indian princely states and took possession of your sub-continent.

The two great wars of our century were finally won by the superior and cheaper production of weapons and everything needed in war by the United States of America. I could go on for hours, enumerating similar examples, and everybody present could fill in my list of examples with so many more examples, some better and more convincing than mine.

Let me then conclude this introduction to the last Chapter by saying that the difference in the level of productivity between different societies has engendered war between them from ancient times till today.

Today, we are all equal under the Law of the

United Nations. When the Republic of East Irian, now in the making, is admitted to the United Nations, it will have there the same rights as the United States of America. One member-State, one vote. The delegates of the United States and those of East Irian will have the same tuxedos and the same black ties. Yet one will represent a nation of the nuclear age, the other a people of the stone age.

We have reached the highest point in the materialisation of the dream of the rationalists and the Jacobins : sovereign equality of all peoples and nations; we have at the same time the *greatest inequality* of peoples and nations of the world *in praxis* because of their extremely *unequal* level of productivity of labour. And this inequality tends to increase practically by the hour.

This inequality in productivity has its reflection in the inequality of standard of living, in the inequality of economic wealth of whole societies, in the inequality of the conditions of economic inter-state relations, in the inequality of defense potentials; and, as a result of all this, in the inequality of political power potential.

While humanity won the battle for the sovereign equality of all nations large and small, the laws of human development brought about the most striking, the most extensive inequality between nations. It turned out that the sovereignty generations had fought for, was a *formal sovereignty* and a *formal equality*.

And so we reach the point, where it is imperative

to complete the programme of all democratic and progressive forces of humanity beyond their goal of formal sovereignty and sovereign equality to the goal of a *substantive sovereignty* and *substantive sovereign equality* of nations.

At this point I would like, first, to define with as much clarity as I can master, the point of departure in the fight for this higher stage of equality of nations.

What are the effects of inequality now prevailing in the world community of nations?

First, the remnants of the previous epoch, the age of steam and electricity. From this time remain foreign investments of industrially developed countries in industrially undeveloped ones, mines, factories and the like, yielding high profits for the owners, nationals of developed countries. Any number of examples can be found of how high these profits run. I like the one I know from my personal experience. It so happened that I was the chief negotiator for Yugoslavia with France after the last war, when our country nationalized all foreign-owned mines, industries, banks, insurance companies and the like. The French demanded indemnity (as did all others). The largest and best French-owned mine in pre-war Yugoslavia was the copper and gold mine of Bor. While studying the data of the case, I ran through the yearly accounts of the French Company of the Mines of Bor. And I found out that in the year 1928—a year of particular prosperity in the period between the two wars—the Company distributed a dividend to the share

holders at the rate of 2882% of the nominal value of each share! And they demanded indemnity! I said to the chief French negotiator that the Yugoslavs had paid the whole value of the mine so many times already. The indemnity, adequate indemnity, as the French said, was a pre-condition for normal economic and trade relations between the two countries. And we had to pay for the mine once more!

An expert on this aspect of international economic relations could give you a survey of many such pre-war relations, and many relationships of the same kind, which appeared in the post-war period.

Besides, the less developed countries are bluntly exploited through a variety of ways and means from discriminatory prices of raw materials as compared to the prices of industrial goods, through discriminatory duties, through tariffs on maritime transport imposed by great maritime Companies still in the hands of developed countries.

But there comes a capital phenomenon. One could call it the law of spontaneous exploitation of less developed areas of the world by the more developed through the mechanism of the world market. The effects of this law made themselves felt as soon as the world market appeared, as soon as the exchange of goods on a world-wide scale reached the level of an extensive world-wide economic division of labour, and there appeared what is known as world market prices.

Here, I have to appear again as a school teacher,

I am afraid. A ton of coal extracted by means of electric pneumatic hammers and brought to the surface on electrically driven elevators, has in the world market exactly the same price as a ton of coal of the same quality, broken from the rock by the most primitive hammers, picks and showels and brought to the surface in straw baskets attached to the ropes and drawn by human beings or animals. The same price! Nevertheless the first ton demanded, say, one hour of human toil, the second 50 hours! A permanent advantage for the economy of the country of the first coal-mine and a permanent disadvantage for the country of the second; in the distribution of wealth produced by the entire world community a constant inequality in favour of the developed and to the detriment of the less developed; an indirect mechanic exploitation of the less developed by the more developed. Besides, the developed can develop their science and technology faster and acquire new advantages over the less developed. That, in short, is the picture.

In short, inequality reproduces itself and increases. And so we have reached the stage of the greatest inequalities that ever existed in the history of mankind.

We have destroyed the great pyramid of nations but after a very short interval the laws of human development have built a new one : a pyramid with two nuclear and electronic super-powers at its top, with a few powers close to them and relentlessly trying to reach their level, and a number of countries

at the industrial steam-and-electricity-level.

The two super-powers tend to dominate the present day world, to impose their will on all the other nation states. They tend to ensure for themselves a sovereignty close to the absolute, while they tend to reduce the sovereignty of others to zero; humanity has undergone this drastic stratification today.

One could illustrate this newest world order in many ways, from many angles, economic, military, and above all, political.

I choose to illustrate it through the role of the super-powers in the United Nations, its organs and agencies. They have some legal position in the organization, which under the Charter or through the United Nations customary law cannot be questioned, at any rate, not easily. They are, with a few other great powers, permanent members of the Security Council. They are permanent members of the Economic and Social Council, they are permanent members of the Board of the Atomic Energy Agency of the UN, they are permanent Co-Chairmen of the Conference of the Disarmament Commission, they are in practice, members of the governing bodies of most of the UN agencies. They are, by custom, entitled to have their nationals in the highest office of the UN Secretariat, continuously flanking the Secretary-General, by tradition a neutral or a non-aligned. What this position inside the organization, combined with the tremendous influence of the super-powers and their close allies amounts to is

common knowledge.

The main instrument of their domination is the Security Council, conceived, in the particular circumstances of the victory of the world democratic coalition headed precisely by the two present-day super-powers. There they enjoy the privilege of the veto, a privilege in flagrant contradiction to the principle of sovereign equality of nations. They use their right of veto very extensively. The excuse is that the right of veto compels the veto-powers to compromise instead of voting over each other; with the extreme examples given that an absence of the veto-right would lead to a decision, by a majority vote, that compulsory military sanctions be taken by the Security Council against a great power, including a super-power, which would be tantamount to the Security Council of the United Nations, an instrument of peace, declaring war against a super-power; this in effect would be a new world war.

This is an extreme and hypothetical example. The one thing the Security Council never undertook was compulsory action or coercive measures of any kind against a member state. What the veto-right prevents in practice is the slightest criticism, the slightest reprimand, by the majority—against a great power, or, God forbid, a super-power.

The best example of this practice is fresh in our memory. It is the example of Czechoslovakia. This independent sovereign country was invaded by the army of a super-power. The government of the invaded country was put under arrest and the Prime

Minister carried away. The Parliament was disbanded. The Foreign Minister of the Government, by coincidence abroad, put up the case to the Security Council of the United Nations. The Security Council met and discussed the issue. But the Soviet veto prevented any decision being taken, even—with the last draft resolution—a decision on purely humanitarian matters.

Another extremely significant case is the case of Vietnam. The war in South Vietnam is a war of the United States against a small people. But this unfortunate people fall into the sphere of control of the United States, according to an old agreement, an agreement based on the decision of the Geneva Conference on Indo-China in 1954. Therefore, whatever happens there, is no business of the Soviet Union. And so both super-powers entered into a silent agreement (not quite silent as many know) that this war is not to be discussed by the Security Council. South Vietnam might be burnt to the ground and its population wiped out; even North Vietnam might occasionally be bombed, it is of no concern to the Security Council.

On the contrary, a war between the Arabs protected by the Soviet Union and the Israelis protected by the United States is a nuisance and a danger to both super-powers. Therefore, such a war has to be prevented and if things go out of hand and hostilities break out, then such a war has to be stopped at once. The Security Council, which never met on Vietnam, met immediately on the two Suez Wars

and immediately stopped them (once, because Great Britain and France opposed such an eventuality with the assistance of the General Assembly).

The disarmament issue, which is one of the main issues of world security, comes time and again to the table of the Security Council. As a rule the Council sanctions agreements reached by the two super-powers, having negotiated between themselves, without consulting the world community. Such decisions have limited the race in its geographic or space dimensions, exactly as it suited the super-powers. Outer space and the heavenly bodies, practically the moon, were excluded; so was the ocean-floor. Test explosions on the surface of the earth, in the atmosphere and in the seas and oceans, were prohibited, but not the underground tests, needed by both super-powers for the further perfection of their nuclear arms.

On the contrary, they agreed to prohibit all non-nuclear powers from producing or acquiring nuclear arms. And the Security Council carried a resolution to this effect, the General Assembly followed, and the monopoly of nuclear weapons for the super-powers became an international law. To the privilege of veto was added a new privilege, the privilege of possessing and producing without any control any amount of nuclear weapons. The fact that the same privilege is enjoyed by Great Britain and France, does not change the picture substantially.

I shall not dwell long on the division of huma-

nity into its developed minority and its developing majority, as it has already been much debated. The main features of it are common knowledge. The growing gap between the two parts of humanity is the *cauchemar* of our days and no resolution is in view. If things drag on the way they do, no one knows how the less developed part of the 7 billion people will be fed around the year 2000.

The developed part of humanity with the nuclear powers at the top seem undisturbed. The Soviet Union has taken the comfortable position that the once colonial powers are solely responsible for the present-day miseries of what were once their colonies. An unwarranted assertion is contradiction to historic facts. Countries have become colonies precisely because of their lower level of productivity of labour. Many have developed considerably under colonial rule, in spite of colonialist exploitation. A considerable amount of infrastructure of their economies was built by the colonial masters : harbors, highways, railways and the like. Mines were opened ; technical and other personnel, educated and trained. And above all: the differences in the levels of development between the two parts of the world have grown larger during and after the colonial period, on a global scale. The United States did not try to do away with their responsibility in such a cheap way. But as to adequate participation in the efforts to stop the gap from growing and finally to make it shrink, they did not do much better than the Soviet Union. They stick to the

assertion that the target of 1 % of the gross national product to be diverted to the assistance of the developing countries is beyond their means. It would be, let me remind you, about 10 billion dollars per year; which would amount to about 6 % of their expenditure on armaments of war.

I do not say, God forbid, that these two countries and many other developed countries do not offer assistance to less developed ones. They do it and this assistance is quite often of really great help. We were twice saved from starvation, because of extremely bad harvests, by the United States. So were India and a number of others; we had, and you have had, efficient financial and technical assistance from developed countries. Some United Nations Agencies—also financed chiefly by the developed countries—gave us palpable assistance.

But, I repeat, in spite of all these mainly bilateral dealings, the gap is growing and there is no remedy to fight this fatal trend.

Yet the means, widely sufficient means, are at the disposal of humanity. Astronomic figures of dollars are spent on the armaments race. The expenses for armaments, maintenance of armed forces and local wars amount for the period after the second world war to approximately 3.5 thousand billion dollars, or, to say it your way, 3.5 lakh crore dollars (of the present value of the dollar). Around 55 % of this sum was spent by the NATO countries, about 30 % by the Warsaw Pact countries and only 15 % by all the rest of the world. NATO and War-

saw pact countries are all developed nations. They wasted close to 3 lakh crore dollars on armaments, armies and warfare since 1945.

As leaders of the family of nations their performance was a poor show!

Let me mention one more failure of the super-powers and the other great powers as the leading powers of humanity in our days. It is their complete failure, so far at least, to take the slightest care of our planet as a common heritage. Their behaviour in this respect is that of a bear in a porcelain shop. They pollute the atmosphere surrounding our globe, they pollute the oceans, they destroy forests and poison rivers. They teach humanity to behave like an enemy of nature, whose child it is. And they do it without the slightest regard to the opinion of others.

Were you, Indians, ever asked whether you agreed to have strontium from nuclear tests to be poured into the atmosphere over your sub-continent? Never! We were never asked. Yet in every rainy season strontium fallout poisons our mountain pastures and our children drink milk that contains this deadly poison.

It is calculated that the United States alone uses about 40% of the oxygen produced per year by the surface of the globe through combustion of fossile fuels. If all the other developed countries are added and their common combustion is extrapolated for another decade, then the "interest" in oxygen will be consumed entirely every year and we shall

start consuming the "capital". As industry and means of transport—particularly jet-propelled airplanes—pollute the atmosphere with carbon-monoxide, carbon-dioxide and sulphur-dioxide, the atmosphere will be deteriorated in one generation's time to such an extent that it will become suffocating while the temperature on the whole globe will start rising. The prospect, for the more distant future, it is true, is the melting of the ice on the two poles, the consequent rise of the level of the seas and oceans and the submerging of large parts of habitable land.

In short, if we do not change the course of history, we sail straight into disaster one way or the other : a nuclear catastrophe or a catastrophe brought about by the pollution of our natural environment.

How to perform the great change?

First, how to define the new goal?

The goal can be defined as a commonwealth of all nations of the globe cooperating loyally and striving for the common good of all mankind.

What humanity possesses by way of knowledge and technical equipment is by right common to all its parts. They all contribute to its creation. Mathematics started in ancient India, geometry in ancient Egypt, physics in ancient Greece, chemistry with the Arabs of the middle ages, anatomy in the Italian Renaissance, etc.

The newest scientific and technological revolution started with Svante Arrhenius, a Swede, with

Niels Bohr, a Dane, with Rutherford, an Englishman, with Pierre Curie, a Frenchman, with Albert Einstein, a German Jew.

The bulk of accumulated modern means of production in the northern hemisphere is the product of the efforts of all humanity. It could not have been accumulated without the toil, and the raw materials of the southern hemisphere. Oil comes from the Middle East, from North Africa and from Venezuela, the copper from Zambia, the Congo and Chile, the uranium from Namibia, etc.

What we possess and what we have achieved together, we should enjoy together, with an equitable participation of all of us. *The right to equitable sharing by all nations of the world's material, natural and acquired wealth, should be the substance of the new, of the substantive equality of nations.*

I admit, I have no blueprint for the functioning of such a world community of nations. It would be idle work anyhow to design such a blueprint. But such and only such can be the new overall goal of all progressive forces; about this there can be no doubt.

The Charter of the United Nations itself was the starting point of this new trend. According to Art.1 of this document, the United Nations was founded, "to achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character..." and, according to Art. 55, they "shall promote: higher standards of living, full employment and conditions of eco-

conomic and social progress and development”.

This position of principle had in the course of time and under the pressure of world conditions of life, an ever increasing importance.

In 1951, on the initiative of the Yugoslav delegation to the 6th General Assembly session, headed by Edvard Kardelj, a resolution was carried which insured the first UN fund for the assistance of developing countries. It was an important breakthrough. Under-development as a world problem was put into focus and under-development was declared to be of concern of the whole international community. The fund itself, the so-called SUN-FED was, for several years, without a penny, but it was in itself a programme. Gradually it was filled with a few dozens of millions of dollars. And then followed a series of other similar undertakings, you are all acquainted with. The highest point reached so far are the United Nations Conferences on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and the Development Decades.

Those most directly concerned, the developing countries, are organized in a special grouping, called the 77 all though they are in fact 94. Their programme is the Charter of Algiers.

Parallel to this development a new UN legislation appeared. The most significant such legislative act is the Resolution called “Resolution on permanent sovereignty of countries over their natural wealth” with which the right of member-states to nationalize foreign-owned mines, oilfields and the

like was established. The text of the Resolution speaks most significantly about “*economic sovereignty*”, a novelty quite in line with my way of thinking.

Meanwhile, essentially the same goal was defined with greater clarity in the Programme of the non-aligned countries at their conference in Cairo, in 1964. It said, “that it is the duty of all countries to contribute to a speedy evolution of a new and equitable economic order in which all nations could live free of fear, poverty and despair, and could achieve their full potential in the family of Nations.”

Thus I arrive at the most important point of this chapter, the most important because it deals with the formation of the new political conscience of humanity at large, and therefore with that feature of our time, wherefrom the prospective of the new world order emerges. It is the appearance of what we currently call the movement of *non-alignment*.

What an improper appellation! What an improper definition, telling only what we are not and not what we are! If we tried to tell what we are, we should be called not the non-aligned nations, but—as a tentative new expression—the *Uniting Nations*, because the essence of the movement is the striving for human unity on a basis corresponding to the imperatives of our epoch.

The inherent spirit of this movement was born, most significantly, in your great country. It was the product of your liberation movement, the largest and the most articulate anti-colonialist movement

of our times.

Do you recognize the following words?

“My understanding of nationalism is that my country ought to be free, but, if it were necessary, let this country die for humanity to survive....I wish to think on the scale of the whole world. My patriotism includes the happiness of mankind. Therefore my service to India includes my service to humanity.”

You did recognize the words of Gandhiji!

He was the spiritual father of the most humanistic movement of our time.

If I tried to translate his spirit into the language of a lawyer, I would say that the essence of this spirit is the *identification of the interests of every nation with the interests of all nations*, the pursuit, by every individual nation, of its objectives through the pursuit of the objectives of all nations. It is the concept of the highest imaginable level of inter-human solidarity.

Such a level of solidarity, just short of the merger of humanity into one integrated whole, presupposes the disappearance of all mistrust between nations and mistrust can disappear only if all nations are equal in fact and not only in form, if they all enjoy not only formal but *substantive sovereignty*. Only substantively sovereign nations could contemplate finally relinquishing their sovereignty in favour of the world commonwealth of nations, the first step of all nations to cease being what they are as separate entities into which humanity is divided,

and merge into one all-human whole.

After the liberation of your country it was the task of Jawaharlal Nehru to give political shape to the Gandhian idea of universal solidarity in the field of an adequate foreign policy for India. He was the first to have used the expression “unaligned” when he said in the Lok Sabha: “What we need is some sort of unaligned foreign policy”.

In taking this course India soon met a few other countries which took a similar course. In the autumn of 1949, at the Fifth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the head of the Yugoslav delegation, Edvard Kardelj, said in the general debate:

“We are confronted with the question whether countries with different social systems can live together and cooperate peacefully... There can be no doubt that such cooperation is possible and necessary, because if we want to have peace we have to secure it under the concrete conditions of our present world, under the conditions of the existence of states with different social systems. Differences in social systems by themselves are obviously not a source of danger of war, if we abide by the principles of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States... The danger of war, therefore, does not threaten because of the differences in social orders, but from imperialist and anti-democratic tendencies in international relations, from the disregard for the principle of equal rights of states and nations, from economic exploitation of other nations, from inter-

ference in the internal affairs of other nations and the like....”

Thus the non-aligned position of Yugoslavia was clearly defined. Among the non-permanent members of the Security Council, newly elected at the same session, were India, Egypt and Yugoslavia. From January 1st, 1950, the delegates of these three countries served in the Council. It was, as you see, 5 years before the Conference in Bandung and 11 years before the first Conference of the non-aligned countries in Belgrade.

The delegates of the three countries—the Indians, Benegal Rau and Rajeshwar Dayal; the Egyptian, Mahmud Fawzi; and the Yugoslav, myself—had each his own worries, the worries of our own countries.

Yet, as it came to world problems, first to the question of who should represent China, the newly established Government of Mao-Tse-Tung or the Government in exile, in Taiwan, the Government of Chaing-Kai-Shek, and later to the question of the Korean war, we discovered that we voted exactly the same way. We voted for the seating of Mao's Government, unlike the western bloc; nor did we walk out as did the Russians. On the Korean issue we voted with everybody appealing to both sides to withdraw to the 38th parallel; but from then on, as the United States used the UN flag for their own war, we started abstaining and became a group known as the abstentionists. The three chief delegates and other members of our three delegations

became close personal friends.

The idea of a non-aligned group of States materialized for the first time.

You know the rest of the story. The three states were joined by an increasing number of other states. At each of three conferences of the non-aligned countries we grew in number.

Pracitically every country, liberated from the colonial yoke and admitted to the United Nations, declared itself non-aligned and joined our movement. The Organization of African States declared itself as a whole to be non-aligned. And we continue to grow. Non-alignment is spreading in Latin America with New Chile, a very staunch supporter of our movement.

The very last months have seen the birth of a new, large, non-aligned country in your part of the world: *Bangladesh*.

The victorious national liberation movement of the people of East Bengal, is the greatest single progressive event of recent years. It was a genuine popular revolution through which a great nation has escaped the domination of a military clique, itself a component part of a military bloc. It was, for us, the non-aligned countries, a new indication of what powerful allies we have outside our ranks, in the opposite camp, or rather, camps.

We, the European non-aligned countries, observe closely the evolution of public-opinion inside the aligned countries of our continent. We observe how large and ever-growing sections of those na-

tions come closer and closer to our positions. A number of political parties declare themselves in favour of a non-aligned policy for their countries. And, farther away or, may be, higher up, in the United States of America, is it not true that the anti-Vietnam war movement is in essence, our ally?

The new monstrous weapons whose production exhausts the economy of the super-powers are practically useless because of their monstrosity itself. Except for the maintenance of the balance of fear, they cannot be of any help. The war in Vietnam, which has brought no victory and no glory to the super-power engaged in it, is there to prove it.

Naturally, history is not a straight highway. It deviates and sometimes turns its back on what is obviously its main direction. But then, suddenly, it makes great leaps forward.

What is essential today is that we, the non-aligned or the United Nations, the conscience of mankind and the main driving force of history in our time, persevere in our efforts, inspired by our profound faith in the brilliant future of mankind.

